

2015 Part B – SPP /APR

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) Part B Indicator Measurement Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Data Source and Measurement	Instructions for Indicators/Measurement
Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE		
<p>1. Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))</p>	<p>Data Source: Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA).</p> <p>Measurement: States must report using the adjusted cohort graduation rate required under the ESEA.</p>	<p><i>Sampling is not allowed.</i></p> <p>Describe the results of the State’s examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2013 APR, use data from 2012-2013), and compare the results to the target. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.</p> <p>Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular diploma and, if different, the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet in order to graduate with a regular diploma. If there is a difference, explain why.</p> <p>Targets should be the same as the annual graduation rate targets under Title I of the ESEA.</p>
<p>2. Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))</p>	<p>OPTION 1:</p> <p>Data Source: Same data as used for reporting to the Department under IDEA section 618.</p> <p>Measurement: States must report a percentage using the number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out in the numerator and the number of all youth with IEPs who left high school (ages 14-21) in the denominator.</p> <p>OPTION 2: Use same data source and measurement that the State used to report in its FFY 2010 APR that was</p>	<p><i>Sampling is not allowed.</i></p> <p>OPTION 1: Use 618 exiting data reported to the Department, and the definitions specified, in the EDFacts file specification C009. http://www2.ed.gov/about/inits/ed/edfacts/eden/non-xml/c009-9-0.doc</p> <p>Include in the denominator the following exiting categories: (a) graduated with a regular high school diploma; (b) received a certificate; (c) reached maximum age; (d) dropped out; or (e) died.</p> <p>Do not include in the denominator the number of youths with IEPs who exited special education due to: (a) transferring to regular education; or (b) who</p>

2015 Part B – SPP /APR

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Data Source and Measurement	Instructions for Indicators/Measurement
	submitted on February 1, 2012.	<p>moved, but are known to be continuing in education.</p> <p>OPTION 2:</p> <p>Use the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistic's Common Core of Data.</p> <p>Data for this indicator are “lag” data. Describe the results of the State’s examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2013 APR, use data from 2012-2013), and compare the results to the target.</p> <p>Provide a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth and, if different, what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs. If there is a difference, explain why.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:</p> <p>A. Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State’s minimum “n” size that meet the State’s AYP/AMO targets for the disability subgroup.</p> <p>B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.</p> <p>C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.</p> <p>(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))</p>	<p>Data Source:</p> <p>3A. (choose either 3A.1 or 3A.2)</p> <p>3A.1 AYP data used for accountability reporting under Title I of the ESEA.</p> <p>3A.2 AMO data used for accountability reporting under Title I of the ESEA as a result of ESEA flexibility.</p> <p>3B. Assessment data reported in the Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) reporting on ESEA (EDFacts file specifications C185 and 188).</p> <p>3C. Assessment data reported in the Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) reporting on ESEA (EDFacts file specifications C175 and 178).</p> <p>Measurement:</p> <p>A. (choose either A.1 or A.2)</p> <p>A.1 AYP percent = [(# of districts with a disability</p>	<p>Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.</p> <p>States are encouraged to present their APR information in summary tables and include multiple years of data for comparison purposes.</p> <p>Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment results, i.e., link to the Web site where results are reported.</p> <p>Indicator 3A: The data source and measurement for 3A is dependent on whether the State applied for, and was granted, a waiver of the requirements to determine Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) for LEAs and schools as part of requesting ESEA flexibility. States that either did not apply for and receive ESEA flexibility, or applied for and received that flexibility but did not apply for a waiver of determining AYP should choose data source and measurement 3A.1. States with an approved ESEA flexibility request that</p>

2015 Part B – SPP /APR

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Data Source and Measurement	Instructions for Indicators/Measurement
	<p>subgroup that meets the State’s minimum “n” size that meet the State’s AYP targets for the disability subgroup) divided by the (total # of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State’s minimum “n” size)] times 100.</p> <p>A.2 AMO percent = [(# of districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State’s minimum “n” size that meet the State’s AMO targets for the disability subgroup) divided by the (total # of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State’s minimum “n” size)] times 100.</p> <p>B. Participation rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs participating in an assessment) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs enrolled during the testing window, calculated separately for reading and math)]. The participation rate is based on all children with IEPs, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.</p> <p>C. Proficiency rate percent = (([# of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned, and, calculated separately for reading and math)]. The proficiency rate includes both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.</p>	<p>includes a waiver of determining AYP should choose data source and measurement 3A.2.</p> <p>Report only on the AYP/AMO assessment targets for reading/language arts and mathematics proficiency, not targets for graduation or other elements of AYP/AMO.</p> <p>Indicator 3B: Provide separate reading/language arts and mathematics participation rates, inclusive of all ESEA grades assessed (3-8 and high school), for children with IEPs. Account for ALL children with IEPs, in all grades assessed, including children not participating in assessments and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.</p> <p>Indicator 3C: Proficiency calculations in this APR must result in proficiency rates for each content area across all ESEA assessments (combining regular and all alternates) for children with IEPs, in all grades assessed (3-8 and high school), including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. States are encouraged to report using two rates – one for reading/language arts covering all assessed grades and one for mathematics covering all assessed grades. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.</p>
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:</p> <p>A. Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and</p>	<p>Data Source:</p> <p>Data collected under section 618 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) (Report of Children with Disabilities Subject to Disciplinary Removal). Discrepancy can be computed by either comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to rates for nondisabled</p>	<p><i>Sampling from State’s 618 data is not allowed.</i></p> <p>Describe the results of the State’s examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2013 APR, use data from 2012-2013), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions of</p>

2015 Part B – SPP /APR

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Data Source and Measurement	Instructions for Indicators/Measurement
<p>B. Percent of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.</p> <p>(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))</p>	<p>children within the LEA or by comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State.</p> <p>Measurement:</p> <p>A. Percent = [(# of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions for greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs) divided by the (# of districts in the State)] times 100.</p> <p>B. Percent = [(# of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards) divided by the (# of districts in the State)] times 100.</p> <p>Include State’s definition of “significant discrepancy.”</p>	<p>children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State’s examination must include one of the following comparisons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State; or • The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to nondisabled children within the LEAs. <p>In the description, specify which method the State used to determine possible discrepancies and explain what constitutes those discrepancies. If the State used a minimum “n” size requirement, report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement. States have the option of using the “total number of districts” OR the “number of districts that meet the State’s minimum n size for one or more racial/ethnic group” as the denominator in the calculation for B4A or B4B.</p> <p>For 4A, provide the actual numbers used in the calculation and if significant discrepancies occurred, describe how the State educational agency reviewed and, if appropriate, revised (or required the affected local educational agency to revise) its policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, to ensure that such policies, procedures, and practices comply with applicable requirements.</p> <p>For 4B, provide the following: (a) the number of districts that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) the number of districts in which policies, procedures or practices contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with</p>

2015 Part B – SPP /APR

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Data Source and Measurement	Instructions for Indicators/Measurement
		<p>requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.</p> <p>If discrepancies occurred and the district with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy and that do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.</p> <p>Targets must be 0% for 4B.</p>
<p>5. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served:</p> <p>A. Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day;</p> <p>B. Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; and</p> <p>C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements.</p> <p>(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))</p>	<p>Data Source: Data collected under IDEA section 618.</p> <p>Measurement:</p> <p>A. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.</p> <p>B. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.</p> <p>C. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.</p>	<p><i>For this indicator, report 618 data that were collected on a date between October 1 and December 1, 2013 and due on February 1, 2014. Sampling from State's 618 data is not allowed.</i></p> <p>Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.</p> <p>If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under IDEA section 618, explain.</p>
<p>6. Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a:</p>	<p>Data Source:</p>	<p><i>For this indicator, report 618 data that were collected on a date between October 1 and December 1, 2013</i></p>

2015 Part B – SPP /APR

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Data Source and Measurement	Instructions for Indicators/Measurement
<p>A. Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and</p> <p>B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.</p> <p>(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))</p>	<p>Data collected under IDEA section 618.</p> <p>Measurement:</p> <p>A. Percent = [(# of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program) divided by the (total # of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs)] times 100.</p> <p>B. Percent = [(# of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility) divided by the (total # of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs)] times 100.</p>	<p><i>and due on February 1, 2014. Sampling from State's 618 data is not allowed.</i></p> <p>If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under IDEA section 618, explain.</p>
<p>7. Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved:</p> <p>A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);</p> <p>B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication and early literacy); and</p> <p>C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.</p> <p>(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))</p>	<p>Data Source:</p> <p>State selected data source.</p> <p>Measurement:</p> <p>Outcomes:</p> <p>A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);</p> <p>B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy); and</p> <p>C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.</p> <p>Progress categories for A, B and C:</p> <p>a. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning = [(# of preschool children who did not improve functioning) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.</p> <p>b. Percent of preschool children who improved</p>	<p><i>Sampling of children for assessment is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See <u>General Instructions</u> on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)</i></p> <p>Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. States will use the progress categories for each of the three Outcomes to calculate and report the two Summary Statements. States have provided targets for the two Summary Statements for the three Outcomes (six numbers for targets for each FFY).</p> <p>Report progress data and calculate Summary Statements to compare against the six targets. Provide the actual numbers and percentages for the five reporting categories for each of the three outcomes.</p> <p>In presenting results, provide the criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers." If a State is using the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary Form (COSF), then the criteria</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Data Source and Measurement	Instructions for Indicators/Measurement
	<p>functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.</p> <p>c. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.</p> <p>d. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.</p> <p>e. Percent of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.</p> <p>Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes:</p> <p>Summary Statement 1: Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool program below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.</p>	<p>for defining “comparable to same-aged peers” has been defined as a child who has been assigned a scored of 6 or 7 on the COSF.</p> <p>In addition, list the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator, including if the State is using the ECO COSF.</p>

2015 Part B – SPP /APR

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Data Source and Measurement	Instructions for Indicators/Measurement
	<p>Measurement for Summary Statement 1: Percent = # of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in category (d) divided by [# of preschool children reported in progress category (a) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (b) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (d)] times 100.</p> <p>Summary Statement 2: The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.</p> <p>Measurement for Summary Statement 2: Percent = # of preschool children reported in progress category (d) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (e) divided by [the total # of preschool children reported in progress categories (a) + (b) + (c) + (d) + (e)] times 100.</p>	
<p>8. Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))</p>	<p>Data Source: State selected data source.</p> <p>Measurement: Percent = [(# of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities) divided by the (total # of respondent parents of children with disabilities)] times 100.</p>	<p><i>Sampling of parents from whom response is requested is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See <u>General Instructions</u> on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)</i></p> <p>Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Include a description of how the State has ensured that the response data are valid and reliable, including how the data represent the demographics of the State. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.</p> <p>If the State is using a separate data collection methodology for preschool children, the State must provide separate baseline data, targets, and actual target data or discuss the procedures used to</p>

2015 Part B – SPP /APR

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Data Source and Measurement	Instructions for Indicators/Measurement
		<p>combine data from school age and preschool data collection methodologies in a manner that is valid and reliable.</p> <p>While a survey is not required for this indicator, a State using a survey must submit a copy of any new or revised survey with its APR.</p> <p>States are encouraged to work in collaboration with their OSEP-funded parent centers in collecting data.</p>
Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representation		
<p>9. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))</p>	<p>Data Source:</p> <p>Data collected under IDEA section 618 (Report of Children with Disabilities Receiving Special Education Under Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, As Amended) and the State’s analysis to determine if the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>Measurement:</p> <p>Percent = [(# of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State)] times 100.</p> <p>Include State’s definition of “disproportionate representation.”</p> <p>Based on its review of the 618 data for FFY 2013, describe how the State made its annual determination that the disproportionate overrepresentation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification as required by §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using</p>	<p>Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for children aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA. Provide these data for all children with disabilities.</p> <p>States are not required to report on underrepresentation.</p> <p>Provide the number of districts identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services and the number of districts identified with disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>Consider using multiple methods in calculating disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups to reduce the risk of overlooking potential problems.</p> <p>Describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation. If the State used a minimum “n” size requirement, report the number of districts totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement because the district did not meet the minimum “n” size for any racial/ethnic group. States have the option of using the “total number of districts” OR the “number of districts that meet the State’s minimum “n” size for one or more racial/ethnic group” as the denominator in the</p>

2015 Part B – SPP /APR

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Data Source and Measurement	Instructions for Indicators/Measurement
	<p>monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum 'n' size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2013 reporting period, i.e., after June 30, 2014. If inappropriate identification is identified, report on corrective actions taken.</p>	<p>calculation.</p> <p>Targets must be 0%.</p> <p>Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response table for the previous APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.</p>
<p>10. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))</p>	<p>Data Source:</p> <p>Data collected under IDEA section 618 (Report of Children with Disabilities Receiving Special Education Under Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, As Amended) and the State's analysis to determine if the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>Measurement:</p> <p>Percent = [(# of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State)] times 100.</p> <p>Include State's definition of "disproportionate representation."</p> <p>Based on its review of the 618 data for FFY 2013, describe how the State made its annual determination that the disproportionate</p>	<p>Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for children aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA. Provide these data at a minimum for children in the following six disability categories: intellectual disability, specific learning disabilities, emotional disturbance, speech or language impairments, other health impairments, and autism. If a State has identified disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories other than these six disability categories, the State must include these data and report on whether the State determined that the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>States are not required to report on underrepresentation.</p> <p>Provide the number of districts identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories and the number of districts identified with disproportionate</p>

2015 Part B – SPP /APR

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Data Source and Measurement	Instructions for Indicators/Measurement
	<p>overrepresentation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification as required by §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum 'n' size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2013, i.e., after June 30, 2014. If inappropriate identification is identified, report on corrective actions taken.</p>	<p>representation that is the result of inappropriate identification. If the State used a minimum “n” size requirement, report the number of districts totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement because the district did not meet the minimum “n” size for any racial/ethnic group. States have the option of using the “total number of districts” OR the “number of districts that meet the State’s minimum n size for one or more racial/ethnic group” as the denominator in the calculation.</p> <p>Consider using multiple methods in calculating disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups to reduce the risk of overlooking potential problems. Describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation.</p> <p>Targets must be 0%.</p> <p>Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP’s response table for the previous APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.</p>
<p>Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B</p>		
<p>Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find</p>		
<p>11. Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that</p>	<p>Data Source: Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system and must be based on actual, not an average, number of days. Indicate if the State has</p>	<p><i>If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.</i></p>

2015 Part B – SPP /APR

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Data Source and Measurement	Instructions for Indicators/Measurement
<p>timeframe. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))</p>	<p>established a timeline and, if so, what is the State's timeline for initial evaluations.</p> <p>Measurement:</p> <p>a. # of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received.</p> <p>b. # of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline).</p> <p>Account for children included in (a), but not included in (b). Indicate the range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluation was completed and any reasons for the delays.</p> <p>Percent = [(b) divided by (a)] times 100.</p>	<p>Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.</p> <p>Note that under 34 CFR §300.301(d), the timeframe set for initial evaluation does not apply to a public agency if: (1) The parent of a child repeatedly fails or refuses to produce the child for the evaluation; or (2) A child enrolls in a school of another public agency after the timeframe for initial evaluations has begun, and prior to a determination by the child's previous public agency as to whether the child is a child with a disability. States should not report these exceptions in either the numerator (b) or denominator (a). If the State-established timeframe provides for exceptions through State regulation or policy, describe cases falling within those exceptions and include in b.</p> <p>Targets must be 100%.</p> <p>Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response table for the previous APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.</p>
Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition		
<p>12. Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for</p>	<p>Data Source: Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data</p>	<p><i>If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data</i></p>

2015 Part B – SPP /APR

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Data Source and Measurement	Instructions for Indicators/Measurement
<p>Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))</p>	<p>system.</p> <p>Measurement:</p> <p>a. # of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.</p> <p>b. # of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to their third birthdays.</p> <p>c. # of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.</p> <p>d. # of children for whom parent refusal to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.</p> <p>e. # of children determined to be eligible for early intervention services under Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.</p> <p>Account for children included in (a), but not included in b, c, d, or e. Indicate the range of days beyond the third birthday when eligibility was determined and the IEP developed, and the reasons for the delays.</p> <p>Percent = [(c) divided by (a - b - d - e)] times 100.</p>	<p><i>are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.</i></p> <p>Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.</p> <p>Targets must be 100%.</p> <p>Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response table for the previous APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.</p>
<p>13. Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition</p>	<p>Data Source:</p> <p>Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system.</p> <p>Measurement:</p> <p>Percent = [(# of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals</p>	<p><i>If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.</i></p> <p>Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.</p> <p>Targets must be 100%.</p>

2015 Part B – SPP /APR

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Data Source and Measurement	Instructions for Indicators/Measurement
<p>services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority.</p> <p>(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))</p>	<p>related to the student’s transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority) divided by the (# of youth with an IEP age 16 and above)] times 100.</p>	<p>Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP’s response table for the previous APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.</p>
<p>14. Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were:</p> <p>A. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.</p> <p>B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.</p> <p>C. Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.</p> <p>(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))</p>	<p>Data Source: State selected data source.</p> <p>Measurement:</p> <p>A. Percent enrolled in higher education = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.</p> <p>B. Percent enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.</p> <p>C. Percent enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they</p>	<p><i>Sampling of youth who had IEPs and are no longer in secondary school is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates of the target population. (See <u>General Instructions</u> on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)</i></p> <p>Collect data by September 2014 on students who left school during 2012-2013, timing the data collection so that at least one year has passed since the students left school. Include students who dropped out during 2012-2013 or who were expected to return but did not return for the current school year. This includes all youth who had an IEP in effect at the time they left school, including those who graduated with a regular diploma or some other credential, dropped out, or aged out.</p> <p>I. Definitions</p> <p><u>Enrolled in higher education</u> as used in measures A, B, and C means youth have been enrolled on a full- or part-time basis in a community college (two year program) or college/university (four or more year program) for at least one complete term, at any time in the year since leaving high school.</p>

2015 Part B – SPP /APR

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Data Source and Measurement	Instructions for Indicators/Measurement
	<p>left school and were enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.</p>	<p><u>Competitive employment</u> as used in measures B and C means that youth have worked for pay at or above the minimum wage in a setting with others who are nondisabled for a period of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes military employment.</p> <p><u>Enrolled in other postsecondary education or training</u> as used in measure C, means youth have been enrolled on a full- or part-time basis for at least 1 complete term at any time in the year since leaving high school in an education or training program (e.g., Job Corps, adult education, workforce development program, vocational technical school which is less than a two year program).</p> <p><u>Some other employment</u> as used in measure C means youth have worked for pay or been self-employed for a period of at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes working in a family business (e.g., farm, store, fishing, ranching, catering services, etc.).</p> <p>II. Data Reporting</p> <p>Provide the actual numbers for each of the following mutually exclusive categories. The actual number of “leavers” who are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school; 2. Competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education); 3. Enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed); 4. In some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Data Source and Measurement	Instructions for Indicators/Measurement
		<p>training program, or competitively employed).</p> <p>“Leavers” should only be counted in one of the above categories, and the categories are organized hierarchically. So, for example, “leavers” who are enrolled in full- or part-time higher education within one year of leaving high school should only be reported in category 1, even if they also happen to be employed. Likewise, “leavers” who are not enrolled in either part- or full-time higher education, but who are competitively employed, should only be reported under category 2, even if they happen to be enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program.</p> <p>III. Reporting On the Measures/Indicators</p> <p>Targets must be established for measures A, B, and C.</p> <p>Measure A: For purposes of reporting on the measures/indicators, please note that any youth enrolled in an institution of higher education (that meets any definition of this term in the Higher Education Act (HEA)) within one year of leaving high school <i>must</i> be reported under measure A. This could include youth who also happen to be competitively employed, or in some other training program; however, the key outcome we are interested in here is enrollment in higher education.</p> <p>Measure B: All youth reported under measure A should also be reported under measure B, in addition to all youth that obtain competitive employment within one year of leaving high school.</p> <p>Measure C: All youth reported under measures A and B should also be reported under measure C, in addition to youth that are enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program, or in some other employment.</p>

2015 Part B – SPP /APR

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Data Source and Measurement	Instructions for Indicators/Measurement
		Describe the calculations and results using actual numbers and compare these results to the targets. Include a description of how the State has ensured that survey data are valid and reliable, including how the data represent the demographics of the State.
Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision		
<p>15. Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.</p> <p>(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3(B)))</p>	<p>Data Source: Data collected under IDEA section 618.</p> <p>Measurement: Percent = (3.1(a) divided by 3.1) times 100.</p>	<p><i>Sampling is not allowed.</i></p> <p>Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.</p> <p>States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of resolution sessions is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution sessions reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline, targets and improvement activities, and report on them in the corresponding APR.</p> <p>States may express their targets in a range, e.g., 75-85%.</p> <p>If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data under IDEA section 618, explain.</p> <p>States are not required to report data at the LEA level.</p>
<p>16. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.</p> <p>(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3(B)))</p>	<p>Data Source: Data collected under IDEA section 618.</p> <p>Measurement: Percent = [(2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(i)) divided by 2.1] times 100.</p>	<p><i>Sampling is not allowed.</i></p> <p>Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.</p> <p>States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of mediations is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of mediations reaches ten or greater, develop baseline, targets and improvement activities, and report on them in the corresponding APR.</p> <p>States may express their targets in a range, e.g., 75-</p>

2015 Part B – SPP /APR

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Data Source and Measurement	Instructions for Indicators/Measurement
		<p>85%.</p> <p>If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data under IDEA section 618, explain.</p> <p>States are not required to report data at the LEA level.</p>

INDICATOR 17 – STATE SYSTEMIC IMPROVEMENT PLAN

MONITORING PRIORITY – GENERAL SUPERVISION

INDICATOR: The State's SPP/APR includes a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) that meets the requirements set forth for this indicator.

MEASUREMENT: The State's SPP/APR includes an SSIP that is a comprehensive, ambitious, yet achievable multi-year plan for improving results for children with disabilities. The SSIP includes the components described below.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE INDICATOR/MEASUREMENT –

Baseline Data: In its FFY 2013 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2015, the State must provide FFY 2013 baseline data that must be expressed as a percentage and which is aligned with the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities.

Targets: In its FFY 2013 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2015, the State must provide measurable and rigorous targets (expressed as percentages) for each of the five years from FFY 2014 through FFY 2018. The State's FFY 2018 target must demonstrate improvement over the State's FFY 2013 baseline data.

Updated Data: In its FFYs 2014 through FFY 2018 SPPs/APRs, due February 2016 through February 2020, the State must provide updated data for that specific FFY (expressed as percentages) and that data must be aligned with the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities. In its FFYs 2014 through FFY 2018 SPPs/APRs, the State must report on whether it met its target.

OVERVIEW OF THE THREE PHASES OF THE SSIP: It is of the utmost importance to improve results for children with disabilities by improving educational services, including special education and related services. Stakeholders, including parents of children with disabilities, local educational agencies, the State Advisory Panel, and others, are critical participants in improving results for children with disabilities and should be included in developing, implementing, evaluating, and revising the SSIP and included in establishing the State's targets under Indicator 17. The SSIP should include information about stakeholder involvement in all three phases.

Phase I: Analysis (which the State must include with the February 2, 2015 submission of its SPP/APR for FFY 2013):

- Data Analysis;
- Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity;
- State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities;
- Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies; and
- Theory of Action.

Phase II: Plan (which, in addition to the Phase 1 content (including any updates) outlined above, the State must include with the February 1, 2016 submission of its SPP/APR for FFY 2014):

- Infrastructure Development;
- Support for local educational agency (LEA) Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices; and
- Evaluation.

Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation (which, in addition to the Phase I and Phase II content (including any updates) outlined above, the State must include with the February 1, 2017 submission of its SPP/APR for FFY 2015, and update in 2018, 2019, and 2020):

- Results of Ongoing Evaluation and Revisions to the SPP.

SPECIFIC CONTENT OF EACH PHASE OF THE SSIP

Phase I: Analysis

Phase I of the SSIP includes a detailed analysis that will guide the selection of coherent improvement strategies to increase the State's capacity to lead meaningful change in LEAs to improve results for children with disabilities. Phase I must include the following five areas:

- **Data Analysis:** A description of how the State identified and analyzed key data, including data from SPP/APR indicators, 618 data collections, and other available data as applicable, to: (1) select the State-identified Measureable Result for Children with Disabilities, and (2) identify root causes contributing to low performance. The description must include information about how the data were disaggregated by multiple variables (e.g., LEA, region, race/ethnicity, disability category, placement, etc.). As part of its data analysis, the State should also consider compliance data and whether those data present potential barriers to improvement. In addition, if the State identifies any concerns about the quality of the data, the description must include how the State will address these concerns. Finally, if additional data are needed, the description should include the methods and timelines to collect and analyze the additional data.
- **Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity:** A description of how the State analyzed the capacity of its current infrastructure to support improvement and build capacity in LEAs to implement, scale up, and sustain the use of evidence-based practices to improve results for students with disabilities. State systems that make up its infrastructure include, at a minimum: governance, fiscal, quality standards, professional development, data, technical assistance, and accountability/monitoring. The description must include current strengths of the systems, the extent the systems are coordinated, and areas for improvement of functioning within and across the systems. The State must also identify current State-level improvement plans and initiatives, including special and general education improvement plans and initiatives, and describe the extent that these initiatives are aligned, and how they are, or could be, integrated with, the SSIP. Finally, the State should identify representatives (e.g., offices, agencies, positions, individuals, and other stakeholders) that were involved in developing Phase I of the SSIP and that will be involved in developing and implementing Phase II of the SSIP.
- **State-identified Measureable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities:** A statement of the result(s) the State intends to achieve through the implementation of the SSIP. The State-identified result(s) may, but need not, be an SPP/APR indicator or a component of an SPP/APR indicator. The State-identified result(s) must be clearly based on the Data and State Infrastructure Analyses and must be a student-level outcome in contrast to a process outcome. The State may select a single result (e.g., increasing the graduation rate for students with disabilities) or a cluster of related results (e.g., increasing the graduation rate and decreasing the dropout rate for students with disabilities).
- **Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies:** An explanation of how the improvement strategies were selected, and why they are sound, logical and aligned, and will lead to a measurable improvement in the State-identified result(s). The improvement strategies should include the strategies, identified through the Data and State Infrastructure Analyses, that are needed to improve the State infrastructure and to support LEA implementation of evidence-based practices to improve the State-identified result(s) for students with disabilities. The State must describe how implementation of the improvement strategies will address identified root causes for low performance and ultimately build LEA capacity to achieve the State-identified Measureable Result(s) for Students with Disabilities.
- **Theory of Action:** A graphic illustration that shows the rationale of how implementing the coherent set of improvement strategies selected will increase the State's capacity to lead meaningful change in LEAs, and achieve improvement in the State-identified result(s) for children with disabilities.

Phase II: Plan

The focus of Phase II is on building State capacity to support LEAs with the implementation of evidence-based practices that will lead to measureable improvement in the State-identified result(s) for children with disabilities. Phase II builds on the data and infrastructure analyses, coherent improvement strategies, and the theory of action developed in Phase I. The plan developed in Phase II includes the activities, steps and resources required to implement the coherent improvement strategies, with attention to the research on implementation,

2015 Part B – SPP /APR

timelines for implementation and measures needed to evaluate implementation and impact on the State-identified result(s) for children with disabilities.

- **Infrastructure Development:** Specify improvements that will be made to the State infrastructure to better support LEAs to implement and scale up evidence-based practices to improve the State-identified result(s) for children with disabilities. Identify the steps the State will take to further align and leverage current improvement plans and initiatives in the State, including general and special education improvement plans and initiatives, which impact students with disabilities. This section must also identify who will be in charge of implementing the changes to infrastructure, resources needed, expected outcomes, and timelines for completing improvement efforts. In addition, the State should specify how it will involve multiple offices within the State educational agency (SEA), as well as other State agencies, in the improvement of its infrastructure.
- **Support for LEA Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices:** Specify how the State will support LEAs in implementing the evidence-based practices that will result in changes in LEA, school, and provider practices to achieve the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities. This section must identify steps and specific activities needed to implement the coherent improvement strategies, including communication strategies and stakeholder involvement; how identified barriers will be addressed; who will be in charge of implementing; how the activities will be implemented with fidelity; the resources that will be used to implement them; how the expected outcomes of the improvement strategies will be measured; and timelines for completion. In addition, the State should specify how it will involve multiple offices within the SEA (or other State agencies) to support LEAs in scaling up and sustaining the implementation of the evidence-based practices once they have been implemented with fidelity.
- **Evaluation:** The evaluation must include short-term and long-term objectives to measure implementation of the SSIP and its impact on achieving measurable improvement in State-identified result(s) for children with disabilities. The evaluation must be aligned to the theory of action and other components of the SSIP, include how stakeholders will be involved, and include the methods that the State will use to collect and analyze data to evaluate implementation and outcomes of the SSIP. The evaluation must specify how the State will use the information from the evaluation to examine the effectiveness of the implementation of the SSIP and the progress toward achieving intended improvements in the State-identified result(s) for children with disabilities, and to make modifications to the SSIP as necessary, and how information from the evaluation will be disseminated to stakeholders.

Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation

In Phase III, the State must, consistent with the evaluation described in Phase II, assess and report on its progress in implementing the SSIP. This will include data and analysis on the extent to which the State has made progress toward and/or met the State-established short-term and long-term objectives for implementation of the SSIP and its progress in achieving the State-identified Measurable Result for Children with Disabilities. If the State intends to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications, the State must describe how the data from the evaluation support this decision. Also, the State must provide a rationale for any revisions that have been made, or revisions the State plans to make, in the SSIP in response to evaluation data, and describe how stakeholders were included in the decision-making process.

Paperwork Burden Statement

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless such collection displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 1820-0624. It is estimated that respondents will spend approximately 1,700 hours when maintaining and completing the SPP/APR. These times include such things as reviewing instructions, searching any existing data resources, gathering needed data, analyzing collected data, and completing and reviewing the information collection. The obligation to respond to this collection is mandatory (20 U.S.C. 1400, Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA)). Send comments regarding the burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to the U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Ave., SW, Washington, DC 20202-4536 or email ICDocketMgr@ed.gov and reference the OMB Control Number 1820-0624. Note: Please do not return the completed SPP/ APR to this address.